

1 THOMAS TOSDAL, STATE BAR NO. 067834  
ANGELA JAE, STATE BAR NO. 248571  
2 TOSDAL, SMITH, STEINER & WAX  
401 West A Street, Suite 320  
3 San Diego, CA 92101-7911  
Telephone: (619) 239-7200  
4 Fax: (619) 239-6048

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
DEENA DEARDURFF SCHMIDT  
6  
7

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 DEENA DEARDURFF SCHMIDT, ) CASE NO. 07-CV-2343DMS(WMC)  
11 )

12 Plaintiff, )

13 v. )

14 BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE )  
15 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, )  
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY, )  
JEFF SCHEMMEL, DOES 1-15, )

16 Defendants. )  
17

**DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFF'S  
COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF HER EX  
PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER  
COMPELLING DEFENDANTS TO  
PRODUCE UNREDACTED COPIES OF  
ALL DOCUMENTS CONTAINED IN  
INITIAL DISCLOSURES**

18 I, THOMAS TOSDAL, declare:

- 19 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice in the State of  
20 California and a partner of Tosdal, Smith, Steiner & Wax,  
21 attorneys of record for Plaintiff DEENA DEARDURFF SCHMIDT. As  
22 such I have personal knowledge of the facts referenced below.
- 23 2. Plaintiff applies to the Court *ex parte* for an order  
24 compelling Defendants BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA  
25 STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY, and JEFF  
26 SCHEMMEL to produce unredacted copies of all documents  
27 produced with their Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule  
28 26(a) initial disclosures by April 16, 2008, before the early

1 neutral evaluation settlement conference scheduled to be held  
2 on April 21, 2008.

3 3. Counsel for Defendants received notice of this *ex parte*  
4 application on Friday, April 4, 2008, and has indicated that  
5 he does not oppose this application.

6 4. This action was filed in the San Diego Superior Court and  
7 removed by Defendants to District Court.

8 5. On February 25, 2008, both parties timely exchanged witnesses,  
9 documents and other information pursuant to the FRCP 26(a)  
10 initial disclosure requirements.

11 6. A review of Defendants' initial disclosures revealed that  
12 certain documents produced, specifically emails and  
13 correspondence from students and parents, contained  
14 redactions. The substance of the communications was not  
15 redacted but Defendants redacted the names of the persons who  
16 authored them.

17 7. Counsel subsequently met and conferred with counsel for  
18 Defendants by telephone requesting they produce un-redacted  
19 copies of certain documents produced in Defendants' initial  
20 disclosures.

21 8. By letter dated March 10, 2008, Defendants' counsel indicated  
22 that they would provide "unredacted copies of those documents  
23 as soon as the University has complied with its FERPA  
24 obligations."

25 ////

26 ////

27 ////

28 ////

1 9. By letter dated March 25, 2008, counsel again requested they  
2 produce "unredacted copies of all documents contained in the  
3 initial disclosures in advance of the settlement conference"  
4 and that if no agreement could be reached, the issue would be  
5 raised with Magistrate Judge William McCurine.

6 10. The issue of the redacted copies of documents produced by  
7 Defendants in their initial disclosures was raised with  
8 Magistrate Judge McCurine during the April 4, 2008, conference  
9 call.

10 11. Counsel for Defendants indicated that FERPA's confidentiality  
11 requirements, a federal privacy law protecting the disclosure  
12 of educational records, may apply to the documents which would  
13 require either parental/student consent or a court order  
14 before they produced the unredacted documents.

15 12. Counsel indicated that he would seek an order from the Court  
16 *ex parte* compelling the disclosure of the unredacted documents  
17 so that Plaintiff will be fully prepared for her participation  
18 in the settlement conference scheduled to be held on April 21,  
19 2008.

20 13. Counsel for Defendants indicated that he would not oppose the  
21 *ex parte* application.

22 14. Counsel have met and conferred with Defendants' counsel and  
23 unredacted copies of the documents cannot be produced in time  
24 for the settlement conference unless a court order is issued  
25 by this Court *ex parte*.

26 15. Plaintiff will be prejudiced if the *ex parte* motion is heard  
27 according to the regular noticed motion procedures because  
28 Plaintiff will not be able to properly prepare for and fully

1 participate in the early neutral evaluation settlement  
2 conference scheduled for April 21, 2008, without the  
3 unredacted documents.

4  
5 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true  
6 and correct. Executed on this 7<sup>th</sup> day of April 2008 at San Diego,  
7 California.

8  
9 S/Thomas Tosdal  
Thomas Tosdal  
10 [ttosdal@tosdalsmith.com](mailto:ttosdal@tosdalsmith.com)  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26